



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/551,787 | 01/05/2006 | Daniel Gibilini | 2937-130 | 3531 |
| 6449 7590 04/03/2008 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | | |
| EXAMINER MAHONEY, CHRISTOPHER E | | | | |
| ART UNIT 2862 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE 04/03/2008 | | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/551,787

Applicant(s)

GIBLINI

Examiner

Christopher E. Mahoney

Art Unit

2862

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Oct 3, 2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 14-19, 21-22, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oguino (U.S. Pat. No. 4432010). Oguino teaches a display screen comprising, along the direction of propagation of projected light:- a diffuser having an elongated radiation diagram with a horizontal major axis; - a support with a light entry surface having cylindrical focusing elements substantially parallel to the major axis of the radiation diagram of the diffuser, the support further having an opaque layer 24 with apertures (23) adapted to allow the light focused by said focusing elements to pass. The applicant is directed to review col. 1, lines 10-61, col. 3, lines 50-63, col. 4, lines 55-57 and col. 12, lines 20-32 as well as figures 1-4, 6, 9, and 18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguino in view of Mahler (U.S. Pat. No. 2928131) or in view of Nashua (EP 0775935). Oguino teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the surface diffuser. Both Mahler and Nashua teach that it was known to use a surface diffuser. The applicant is directed to review col. 2, lines 48-69 and col. 6, lines 37-45 as well as figures 2-7 and 9-13 of Mahler and review page 2, lines 1-7 and page 2, lines 44 through page 3, line 8 of Nashua. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Mahler or Nashua for the purpose of using readily available diffusers.

Claims 7, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguino in view of Van de Ven (U.S. Pat. No. 5889612). Oguino teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for a holographic diffuser. Van de Ven teaches in col. 6, line 48-col. 7, line 4 as well as figure 2 that it was known to use a holographic diffuser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Van de Ven for the purpose of a slimmer screen.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguino in view of Miyata (U.S. 2001050811). Oguino teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the supplementary Fresnel diffuser. Miyata teaches in figures 4-9 that it was known to use a Fresnel diffuser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Miyata for the purpose of softening incoming projection light.

.Claims 20, 23 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oguino in view of Matsushita (EP0752613). Oguino teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the antiglare support. Matsushita teaches that it was known to provide antiglare on a support. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Matsushita for the purpose of improving image by reducing glare.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E. Mahoney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5PM, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Assouad can be reached on (571) 272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher E Mahoney/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2862